

not even deal with the question or even relate to the question. What the White House has done to a reasonable question for the chain of custody, who had the list, is simply stonewalled. Mr. President, that is not adequate. Nor do I think it is in the interest of the White House to simply stonewall reasonable questions.

The third question: Were the FBI files' information disseminated by White House employees?

Mr. President, that is a reasonable question. Did they—which is really a violation of the law—disseminate the highly confidential information included in those files outside the White House?

How did the White House choose to answer that? Well, the fact is, they answered it in the same style they used in the last question, in No. 7 of their response. They refer you to statements that are not responsive. It is a reasonable question, and it is relevant to potential criminal activity, and it is totally stonewalled by the White House.

The Hatch letter asks: Has the White House requested FBI files on any Members of Congress or employees of Congress?

That is a reasonable question, and here is the answer:

We have no information responsive to your question about requests for FBI reports on Members of Congress or their staffs.

What does that mean? Mr. President, that is a stonewall. That is a total refusal to deal with the questions that are reasonably asked and raised by this inquiry.

Those are four specifics, but there are others.

I note that on CNN news this morning it was reported that a source close to Mr. Livingstone told CNN that Livingstone said the White House has another list that contains the names of top key Republicans whose FBI files they want or may have requested. But the White House has chosen not to share this list with the press.

Mr. President, I have no idea if that is accurate. I assume in due course we will understand. But it comes back and relates to the fact that the committee asked. Had they requested White House files, FBI files, on Members of Congress, or its employees? The White House absolutely stonewalled the question. My sense is this, Mr. President: It is in the interest of this Nation—both Democrats and Republicans—to get this issue behind us, and the White House ought to respond to the questions, get the facts out, solve the problem and move on. But, if they continue to follow the course of totally stonewalling this inquiry, it will not inure to their benefit, and it will not be taken as an appropriate action by the American people.

Mr. President, my own sense is, just as in Watergate, that a dose of honesty and candor is absolutely the best thing that the White House can do.

I mention the following things because I am concerned that the White

House has chosen not to follow that path of honesty and candor.

That is a serious charge. Let me be specific, because I think it merits specifics.

In response to the questions about this issue about Travelgate, the White House on June 6 came back and said, "Yes. Files were requested, but the GAO did it." This is on Billy Dale. They blamed the requesting of the files on the GAO. The facts turn out that the GAO denied it. And it turns out that the GAO did not do it at all. The White House statement was inaccurate.

On June 6 the White House indicated that they had requested 338 files. Mr. President, that was inaccurate. On June 13 the same White House admitted that they had really requested 132 more for a total of 470 files. Mr. President, that statement was inaccurate.

On June 15, the FBI Director indicates that the White House had requested 481 files. Now the reports are that that may be too low as well.

Is the point how many files they requested? Well, it is relevant. We ought to know it. But I think it is much more important that the White House has chosen not to be forthcoming and give us accurate answers on these questions.

On June 10 the White House said that this whole incident was an accident because the Secret Service had given them an outdated list. That is, the request had gone in and included names that were inappropriate because the Secret Service had given them the wrong list. But on June 13 the Secret Service responded, and indicated and pointed out that their system is incapable of providing a list that the White House used to request files. The statement of the White House on June 10 appears to be inaccurate. It appears to have been impossible for the Secret Service files to produce the list that the White House said that they got because of inaccurate action on the part of the Secret Service. Moreover, it appears that their suggestion that they could not have a current list from the Secret Service was inaccurate; the Secret Service had produced a number of lists updated that could not have possibly included any of those names.

Finally, Mr. President, the White House has said this was a low-level bureaucratic mistake. That is the White House explanation—a "low-level bureaucratic mistake."

Mr. President, I will leave it up to Members and their own judgment. Mr. Livingstone's position was head of White House personnel security. That is not a low-level bureaucrat. Head of security at the White House is not a low-level bureaucrat. He was paid \$65,000 a year, or thereabouts, at least from the indications we have gotten from the committee. I do not believe—Members can make their own judgment—that someone paid \$65,000 a year is appropriately called a low-level bureaucrat.

Mr. President, the point is not just that the White House has made inac-

curate statements, or the White House has refused to answer questions.

The point is this: Where do we go from here? My hope is that the White House will do a couple of things: Get the facts out, be honest, and let us get this issue behind us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### STALEMATE IN THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT/CAREERS ACT CONFERENCE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned by very partisan, political tone that is beginning to cloud deliberations over the Workforce Development/Careers Act legislation now in conference. The blame for this development cannot be placed at the doorstep of any individual or any political party. I am afraid that everyone is at fault, and that there is enough blame for everyone.

I voted for the Senate bill in committee and on the floor. I did so for several reasons. It brought a sweeping reform and a consolidation of a multiplicity of existing programs that simply were not working very well. It represented a new and innovative Federal-State partnership in administering programs that are so very important to the education and training needs of our Nation. And most important to me, it contained a series of very strong vocational and adult education provisions.

Unfortunately, the bill that is being developed in conference differs considerably from the one the Senate passed. The concept of a new Federal-State partnership that was a key element of the Senate bill is gone. The Senate provision that continued support for School To Work Programs appears doomed. A strong within-State formula that sends vocational education funds to those districts most in need is endangered.

Equally important, the need for reform is being lost in a battle for political gain. The lines of differences are hardening, and there is an all-or-nothing attitude beginning to develop on all sides. We have a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress and a Democratic administration. Yet, instead of a good give and take, instead of compromises in which both sides, we are reaching a stalemate that literally ignores the needs of millions of adult and young people who need these education and training services and who could rightfully care less who gets the credit.

Mr. President, I deeply regret this situation. I would implore both sides to erase the lines that have been drawn in the sand, and get back to the table in a serious spirit of bipartisanship. I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to refrain from anything that might be labeled a "Republican" bill. I would urge my fellow Democrats in both the Congress and the administration to refrain from an uncompromising insistence on provisions that will ultimately doom this

important legislation. I would ask everyone to lay their political labels aside and move ahead with one thing in mind: the need to produce a good bill that helps Americans who need our help.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON'S FOREIGN POLICY ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, 1996 is fast emerging as one of the most critical years of the post-cold-war period. Earlier this year, Taiwan concluded Presidential elections, taking a firm step toward a pro-democratic course under China's watchful eye. India and Israel recently held elections that resulted in dramatic shifts of power in both countries. Russia just concluded the first round of balloting in its Presidential elections, and a second round is scheduled shortly in which Russians will face a stark choice between the West-leaning Yeltsin and the former communist Zyuganov. Later this year, Bosnia is scheduled to hold elections as well, the outcome of which may well determine whether that war-torn, fragmented country will continue to exist.

As President Clinton said recently, "we live in a moment of hope." The demise of the cold war, the emergence of democratic trends across the globe, advances in telecommunications and the exchange of information—all of these are helping to create a new international environment, which will force a realignment in the fundamental relationship between States, and augurs for a more stable and cooperative world.

As we complete what appears to be a transition period into an era of unprecedented opportunity, the world will look to the United States—as the only true remaining superpower—for guidance and moral authority. Any President of the United States, of course, immediately plays an epic role on the world's stage. But President Clinton seems to be paying a more critical role than most.

During the past 4 years, the Clinton administration has worked assiduously to exert influence over and capitalize on the momentous changes that have occurred. President Clinton's solid record of achievement, I would argue, demonstrates beyond all doubt that he has the requisite vision and courage to steer the ship of state into the next century. If you will permit me, I will give a brief tour of the international horizon to underscore my point.

In Europe and the former Soviet Union, the Clinton administration has achieved some of its greatest foreign policy successes. Clinton's active engagement in Bosnia—a mine field where Presidents, policymakers, and pundits once feared to tread—has brought a halt to the bloodshed and killing in one of Europe's most destructive and intractable conflicts. The presence of U.S. troops—whom early critics predicted would be drawn into a fighting war—has proven to be the key

ingredient in setting the stage for the return of stability. In the next several months, the administration looks to be equally engaged in ensuring that the proper circumstances arise for free and fair elections to take place, which would go a long way toward paving the way for a U.S. withdrawal and bringing the issue to a close.

Russia follows close on Bosnia's heels as a major foreign policy success. The recent conclusion of the first round of the Presidential elections is a remarkable development in and of itself. For the first time in Russia's history, a Russian leader has endeavored to seek reelection, further strengthening prospects for the emergence of a Russian democratic culture. And the Clinton administration's policy of engaging—without actually endorsing—Yeltsin appears now to have been brilliantly conceived and well implemented.

Turning to Asia, one simply cannot neglect China. China is the most important country in the region, and the United States-China bilateral relationship is one of the most critical in the world. Our relations with China are so complex and multifaceted that it is difficult to do them justice in so brief a discussion. I would only say that in such an intricate relationship, there are bound to be successes as well as failures. I, for one, credit the Clinton administration for pursuing a better trade relationship with China, which can promote cooperation, and ultimately progress, in other areas. I think the agreements on trade the administration has achieved so far constitute a good foundation, but the key challenge from here is to ensure that agreements are enforced and commitments honored in order for broader progress to come.

Elsewhere in Asia, the administration's actions with regard to North Korea deserve special mention and commendation. It is indeed no small matter that the Clinton administration has, in essence, prevented one of the world's most dangerous rogue states from going nuclear. In doing so, the administration has set a strong precedent and learned invaluable lessons that it can apply to other aspiring nuclear powers.

In the Middle East, the Clinton administration has made a superb effort to stabilize the region and broaden international acceptance of Israel. Israel's peace agreements with Jordan and the Palestinians represent achievements that are, in my view, irreversible. I am sure that the election of a new government in Israel will prompt some changes in the calculus for a comprehensive peace, which ultimately should include Lebanon, Syria, and the Persian Gulf States. But I would argue that whatever changes occur are more likely to have an impact on the timing, rather than the inevitability, of normal relations between Israel and the Arab States.

In the Western Hemisphere, the Clinton administration can say with pride that democratically elected govern-

ments exist in every country of the region save one. And the one exception, Cuba, has become the target of particularly vigorous sanctions effort, which the administration hopes will hasten the fall of the Castro regime and open the way for the transition to democracy. Although I must confess to having opposed the tightening of sanctions, I cannot argue with the administration's intent.

The administration's effort to restore Haitian President Aristide to power represents, of course, a milestone in the hemisphere's transition to democracy. In Haiti, much as in Bosnia, this administration inherited a seemingly insoluble problem, to which it brought energy, courage, creativity, and ultimately, a resolve to use justifiable force, and thereby achieved its goal.

Finally, Mr. President, I would say a word about Africa, where United States interests have not been so easily defined as they have elsewhere, and which consequently has suffered occasionally from a lack of attention from Washington. Not so with the Clinton administration, which has made a real effort to promote stability, encourage the emergence of democratic trends, and disburse U.S. assistance effectively to promote sustainable development. The obvious high point is, of course, the peaceful transfer of power and the domestic election of President Mandela in South Africa. But there are equally important—if lesser known—success stories such as Botswana, which enjoys a freely elected government and recently graduated altogether from United States assistance.

To sum up, each of the highlights that I have touched upon represent significant achievements in their own right. In and of themselves, they command respect and recognition of a job well done by the Clinton administration in the foreign policy area. Collectively, they provide overwhelming evidence that the administration is up to the challenge of leading the United States into the next millennium, which holds promise for tremendous opportunity for our country and its citizens.

#### PROGRESS IN THE MIDDLE EAST PEACE TALKS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wish today to emphasize the hope all Texans and all Americans have for continued progress in the Middle East peace talks as heads of state of Arab countries begin a summit meeting in Cairo, Egypt.

These leaders are meeting the same week that Prime Minister-elect Benjamin Netanyahu presented his new cabinet to the Israeli Knesset for approval. Prime Minister-elect Netanyahu has expressed his own support for peace by listing as a guideline of his new Government that "Israel will work to broaden the circle of peace with all of its neighbors."

Mr. President, the United States must continue to be an important influence for peace in the Middle East